

In re Application of: Efraim ATAD et al
Serial No.: 10/810,558
Filed: March 29, 2004
Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Amit K. Ray
Group Art Unit: 2623
Attorney Docket: 27613

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 24 are in this Application. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 16 – 18 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 4, 6 -7, 12, 14 -15 and 19 - 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claim 3 has been canceled herewith. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended herewith. Claim 25 is new.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1 - 24 are in this Application. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 16 – 18 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of Mehravari.

Mehravari teaches a communication system based on wireless neighbourhood area networks. Mehravari shows in Fig. 4 a satellite receiver which receives television signals for the user's television.

Mehravari clearly shows that the satellite receiver is connected to the user's television and other domestic systems. Mehravari clearly shows that the wireless neighbourhood area network receiver is also connected to the user's domestic network.

Mehravari however also clearly shows – see figure 4, that the neighbourhood transmitter receiver is connected to the side of the house and the satellite connector is on the roof of the house. The receivers are each connected independently to the domestic network. There is no *association* between the satellite and terrestrial antennas in Mehravari, contrary to the requirements of claim 1.

More specifically, satellite 518 is connected via box 519 to switch 560 where it joins the domestic network. Neighbourhood area receiver 620 is connected via processor 600 to the domestic network at processor 570. It is noted that both a switch and a processor are active devices which can actively switch signals and make changes in the way the signals are switched. A splitter-combiner is generally a passive device and is not a switch, but rather is a simple fork connection, having two

In re Application of: Efraim ATAD et al
Serial No.: 10/810,558
Filed: March 29, 2004
Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Amit K. Ray
Group Art Unit: 2623
Attorney Docket: 27613

inputs at one end and a single input at the other end so that signals going in one direction are combined into a single cable, and signals going the other way are split from the single incoming cable onto two cables.

A switch is an active device, which receives an input and decides whether or not to pass it on. Alternatively a switch may decide which way out of a choice of ways to pass on the signal. A processor does the same thing. Neither a switch nor a processor however splits an input signal so that it appears simultaneously on two outputs. At the most it could multiplex onto the two outputs. Conversely a switch cannot combine the signals. A processor probably could combine two signals coming from different inputs using an adder. However in order to do this it would have to digitize the signal so that the output would not be the combination of the inputs but a digital version thereof. Even if the signal were converted back to analog at the output it would still only be an approximation of the combined signals and thus not the same as a combiner.

It is further noted that in systems designed for video, the skilled person would never use a switch or processor when a splitter-combiner is recommended, and conversely would never use a splitter-combiner where a switch or a processor are recommended.

Thus, since a splitter-combiner is both structurally and functionally distinct from either a switch or a processor, Mehravari does not teach the splitter-combiner of claim 1. Mehravari furthermore does not hint at replacing the switch 560 with a splitter combiner because the splitter-combiner would not fulfill the switching function that Mehravari describes for switch 560 which is to route certain signals to device 580 and certain signals to device 585 – the splitter combiner would simply split signals arriving at the input to appear on both outputs. Rather a splitter combiner requires a 2:1 fork structure – either two inputs to one output or one input to two outputs, with the structure fixed, so that the stem and the branches are always the same. Mehravari however describes a structure in which any connection can go to any

In re Application of: Efraim ATAD et al
Serial No.: 10/810,558
Filed: March 29, 2004
Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Amit K. Ray
Group Art Unit: 2623
Attorney Docket: 27613

connection, there is no stem and there are no branches. Thus a splitter-combiner would be useless.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is allowable, at least for the reason that the splitter-combiner is not taught or suggested by Mehravari.

The splitter combiner is included in the remaining independent claims.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on allowable main claims.

Claim 25 is a new claim which distinguishes over Mehravari in that a single cable connects the two rooftop components of a rooftop installation to the interior of a building. Mehravari only has one component on a rooftop and the two components he has are connected by separate cables to the interior of the building.

All the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 - 25 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: June 3, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension (3 Months)
- Additional Claims Transmittal Fee